

Lead Entity Advisory Group
October 4, 2005
Cascade Mountain Inn
Cle Elum, WA 98922
Summary Notes

LEAG Attendance:	<p>Doug Osterman, WRIA 9 Jeanette Dorner, Nisqually Tribe Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Richard Brocksmith, Hood Canal Coordinating Council Martha Neuman, Snohomish County Kristi Lynett, WDFW Melissa Paulson, WDFW Tim Smith, WDFW John Sims, Quinault Nation Frank Sweet, City of Selah Stormy Sweet, City of Selah Mark Dubois, IAC/SRFB Neil Aaland, IAC/SRFB Alan Chapman, Lummi Tribe WRIA 1 Juli Post, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board Mary Jorgenson, WRIA 8 Barbara Rosenkotter, San Juan County Scott Jungblom, Pend Oreille CD Mark Cookson, WDFW Bill Towey, Colville Tribe Joy Juelson, Chelan County Paul Dorn, Squamish Tribe, WRIA 14 Jim Kramer, Puget Sound Shared Strategy</p>
WDFW Report	<p>WDFW is still working toward posting the Lead Entity Coordinator position. When available, WDFW staff will forward the job posting to lead entity coordinators for their information and distribution.</p> <p>Paul Dorn was nominated and elected LEAG vice-chair. Doug Osterman was nominated and reelected LEAG chair.</p>
Discussion of Regional Board SRFB Funding Request and Implementation Proposals	<p>Jim Kramer (Puget Sound Shared Strategy) presented information on Shared Strategy's draft recommendations for the roles, functions, and organizational structure for implementing the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan. He noted that NOAA is off schedule in reviewing the Plan, but that the JLARC audit was extremely favorable and that legislators are pleased. All the regional boards are to be submitting proposals for implementation constructs and requests for funding for the biennium to the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office by 10/17/05. The Salmon Recovery Funding Board will be asked to fund the regional boards at its 10/28/05 meeting. Jim suggested that the SRFB process may need to be revised, given the completion of Regional Recovery Plans, and encouraged LEAG members to be thinking about possible viable suggestions. For example, the Puget Sound Plan calls for a doubling of the effort, and, by the 3rd year of</p>

	<p>implementation, the spigot is to be turned on. He felt, given this approach, that there is no need to continuously scrub and re-scrub plans/strategies. Please see attached documents (<i>Discussion with LEAG</i> and <i>Draft For Discussion 9/29/05</i>) for more information on the Puget Sound proposals for implementation.</p> <p>Several Lead Entities agreed that an overhaul of the system is needed, but that a way needs to be found that meets the needs of the Regions without zeroing out the Lead Entities. Others commented that there is reluctance to delegate to the state and the regional construct makes sense, however, the Lead Entities should always remain the focus of the habitat components of the regional plans. Others noted structural problems, for example, that priorities across some regions have not been clearly established. A suggestion to have Regions request funding through the Lead Entities was raised as an approach to reduce hesitation from Lead Entities (whose only source of implementation funds is the SRFB) to support SRFB allocations to Regions.</p> <p>For more information, please refer to a one-page discussion paper that Jim Kramer used to guide his presentation (Discussion with LEAG dated October 4, 2005).</p>
Monitoring Update	<p>Richard Brocksmith indicated no new developments regarding Implementation and Effectiveness Monitoring discussions. He noted that the issue still remains that we are not getting all projects monitored; that local information needs are not being answered by the current SRFB approach. LEAG reconfirmed its position that effectiveness monitoring should be done on every project. Richard provided a brief update on intensively monitored watersheds (PNAMP) as part of Validation Monitoring. He queried the group to see if people felt that Tetra Tech's communication with Lead Entities is improving; the response was uncertain. Finally, Richard expressed concern that the Lead Entities and local organizations continue to be not included in meetings on Status and Trends Monitoring; that Lead Entities are not invited.</p>
SRFB 6th Round	<p>Neil Aaland reviewed funding distribution guidelines for SRFB 2nd Increment in the past, and asked LEAG members and Lead Entity coordinators for input regarding 2nd Increment fund disbursement for this grant cycle. Neil suggested three possible options: 1) Same process as last year (A, B, C grouping); 2) Some sort of Regional revision; 3) Combination/Other. Suggestions from LEAG/LE coordinators included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Allocate a certain percentage (eg: 80%) of the second increment equally to eight geographic regions (including the regions and northeast and coastal Washington), with another increment (eg: 20%) allocated toward projects statewide at the discretion of the Board. (2) Allocate a certain percentage of the second increment to the eight geographic regions, but that the amount allocated to each should be at the discretion of the SRFB. Another percentage, like (1) above, should be allocated toward projects statewide at the discretion of the Board. (3) Do something similar to last year by dividing LEs into groups based on the evaluations/scoring by the Review Panel; IF there is a "natural break" between "best" and "good", then allocate a higher amount of the second

	<p>increment toward the “best” grouping, and a lower percentage of the increment to the “good” grouping. Lots of percentage breakdowns were suggested, but the final breakdown should be determined after the size of the groups is known (for example, many Lead Entities are likely to fall into the “best” group since regional plans are now done and lists appear to be consistent with them). A percentage was also suggested for statewide discretion by the Board under this third approach.</p> <p>The most often mentioned amount for the statewide discretion allocation was 20% of the second increment.</p> <p>General comments included: consideration of local priorities; equal distribution of funds across geographic regions; reevaluation of “fit to strategy;” consideration of effect on listed species; and the possibility of a 2nd Increment process that includes distinct allotment standards (possible A & B grouping only) plus a “discretionary fund” for deserving projects or areas judged to be underfunded. Several LEs cautioned changing the process/allocation too significantly as it is quite late in the cycle.</p> <p>Neil will take the range of suggestions above to the SRFB for its consideration on October 28. A decision on the second increment funding is not expected until the 12/1/05-12/02/05 SRFB meeting. Neil also requested space on the next LEAG meeting agenda to begin discussion about SRFB 7th Round funding (since there was significant concern about a needed overhaul of the approach).</p>
Discussion of WWRP Riparian Protection Program	<p>Neil Aaland announced that the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program's Riparian Protection Program as a potential additional funding source for future lead entity projects. The grant funds exist for acquisition (or combination acquisition/restoration) projects, as well as Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program leases/extensions, etc. The grant program will become available in two years if funding is allocated; applications are anticipate in May 2006. Please see handout (<i>Memorandum 9/27/05, WWRP Riparian Habitat Program – Update</i>) for more information. A group that Neil assembled will begin advising on the program's components on October 6. Doug Osterman has been asked to represent LEAG on the group.</p>
Discussion of Habitat Work Schedule Workshop	<p>Tim Smith reported that WDFW has submitted a supplemental budget request for the last half of this biennium totaling \$500,000, with the hope that this amount would become part of the base budget amount for the '07-'09 biennium. Supplemental monies will be used to leverage additional federal funds for Habitat Work Schedule Implementation. A question was raised as to whether LE coordinators could lobby for the supplemental budget request. Coordinators wishing to provide input on the issue were directed to contact Jim Cahill and Elliot Marks in the Office of Financial Management.</p> <p>Tim also emphasized that WDFW is dedicated to providing a useful, flexible data management tool to LEs. WDFW's hope is to help lead entities move towards a more broad watershed role, with the intent that LEs would act as “match makers” between projects and potential funding sources across the watershed. Tim explained the RFP process for developing a Habitat Work Schedule tool and solicited input from Lead Entity coordinators. Jeanette Dorner, Richard Brocksmith, Martha Neuman, and Juli</p>

	Post have volunteered to assist with the development process. Please see attached document (<i>HWS Workshop Summary</i>) for more information.
NEXT MEETING	Seatac, Not Yet Scheduled